UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,701	08/05/2003	Douglas A. Wood	RSW920030050US1	7561

43168 7590 06/25/2009

MARCIA L. DOUBET LAW FIRM
PO BOX 422859
KISSIMMEE, FL 34742

EXAMINER	
RADTKE, MARK A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/25/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mld@mindspring.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/634,701	WOOD, DOUGLAS A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARK A. X RADTKE	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 April 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5,7,9-13 and 17-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3, 5, 7, 9-13 and 17-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10 April 2009 has been entered.

Remarks

2. In response to communications filed on 10 April 2009, claim(s) 1, 5, 7, 9, 11-12 and 17 is/are amended and new claim(s) 18-25 is/are added per Applicant's request. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9-13 and 17-25 are presently pending in the application, of which, claim(s) 1, 17, 20 and 23 is/are presented in independent form.

3. Claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are statutory with respect to recent case law regarding 35 U.S.C. 101 because the addition of the phrase "computer-implemented" ties the claims to particular computing hardware (i.e. a machine).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9-13 and 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over RDF Syntax ("Resource Description Framework (RDF) Model and Syntax Specification" by W3C, 8 October 1998. Available online at http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/article/lassila98resource.html) in view of Brunet (U.S. Pat. No. 6,654,759), and further in view of Vaschillo (U.S. Pat. No. 7,403,956).

As to claim 1, RDF Syntax teaches a computer-implemented method of uniquely identifying resources (see section 1, "Introduction"), comprising steps of:

modeling the resources using a hierarchical schema, wherein classes in the hierarchical schema correspond to resource types (see section 1, paragraph 5, line 4, "Classes are organized in a hierarchy") and wherein instances in the hierarchical schema represent individual resources, each instance being defined according to a class definition of a selected one of the classes that corresponds to the resource type of the individual resource represented by the instance (see section 2.1, paragraph 1, last sentence, "resources correspond to objects and properties correspond to instance variables"); and

defining, in the class definition of a topmost class of the hierarchical schema, a naming rule property and an instance identity property (see section 2.2., paragraph 2, "XML rules"), wherein:

each class at levels of the hierarchical schema beneath the topmost class inherits the naming rule property and the instance identity property (see section 1, paragraph 5).

RDF Syntax does not explicitly teach

the naming rule property for storing a naming rule for each of the classes in an associated naming rule property value, and the instance identity property for storing an identity of each of the instances in an associated instance identity property value,

thereby requiring each class in the hierarchical schema to store a class-specific naming rule as the value of the naming rule property and each instance of each of the classes to store an instance-specific identity as the value of the instance identity property;

the naming rule for each class specifies at least one property defined in the class definition of that class, and is used for creating the identity for each instance of that class; and

the naming rule for each of the classes is selected to ensure that the identity created for each of the instances of each of the classes is unique within the hierarchical schema.

However, Brunet teaches

thereby requiring each class in the hierarchical schema to store a class-specific naming rule as the value of the naming rule property and each instance of each of the classes to store an instance-specific identity as the value of the instance identity property (see col. 7, ll. 35-41, "uniquely identified");

the naming rule for each class specifies at least one property defined in the class definition of that class, and is used for creating the identity for each instance of that class (see col. 7, ll. 41-43); and

the naming rule for each of the classes is selected to ensure that the identity created for each of the instances of each of the classes is unique within the hierarchical schema (see col. 7, ll. 18-32, "uniquely").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time the invention was made to have modified RDF Syntax by the teaching of Brunet for the benefit of automatically and uniquely identifying class instances (see Brunet, col. 7, ll. 30-32).

RDF Syntax, as modified, still does not explicitly teach the naming rule property for storing a naming rule for each of the classes in an associated naming rule property value, and the instance identity property for storing an identity of each of the instances in an associated instance identity property value;

wherein the naming rules are class-specific.

However, Vaschillo teaches the naming rule property for storing a naming rule for each of the classes in an associated naming rule property value (see column 9, line 39 – column 10, line 16), and the instance identity property for storing an identity of each of

the instances in an associated instance identity property value (see column 2, lines 4-20);

wherein the naming rules are class-specific (see column 12, line 42-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time the invention was made to further modify RDF Syntax by the teachings of Vaschillo to avoid "name clashes" (see Vaschillo, column 11, lines 8-11).

As to claim 3, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches further comprising locating a particular instance that represents a particular resource using the value of the instance identity property for that instance (see section 6, Formal Grammar for RDF).

As to claim 5, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein:

the naming rule a selected one of the classes (The beginning of this limitation is unclear) further specifies a scoping context selected to ensure that each of the identities created using that naming rule are unique within the scoping context (see Brunet, Abstract); and

the value of the instance identity property for each of the instances created using that naming rule further specifies the scoping context (see section 2.2.1).

As to claim 7, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the scoping context comprises a scoping class name that identifies one of the classes that is distinct from the selected one of the classes and, for each of the at least one property specified in the

naming rule for the identified distinct one of the classes, a name and value pair comprising that property and a corresponding value, for the resource represented by a particular instance of the identified distinct one of the classes, of that property (see Brunet, Abstract).

As to claim 9, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein:

the naming rule for the selected one of the classes further specified a root context corresponding to a root of the hierarchical schema to ensure that each of the identities created using that naming rule are unique within the scoping context within the root context (see Brunet, col. 7, ll. 50, "ROOT"); and

the value of the instance identity property for each of the instances created using that naming rule further specifies the root scope (see section 2.2.1, page 2, "namespace").

As to claim 10, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the root scope comprises a domain name (see section 2.2.1, page 2, where "domain name" is read on "description.org").

As to claim 11, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the value of the naming rule property for each of the classes is specified using a structured document (See section 2.2. XML is a structured document format).

As to claim 12, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the value of the naming rule property for each of the classes is specified using a structured markup language (See section 2.2. XML is a structured markup language).

As to claim 13, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchical schema is an object-oriented schema (see section 1, paragraph 5).

As to claim 17, RDF Syntax teaches a method of generating unique resource identities (see section 1), comprising steps of:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claims 18, 21 and 24, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the value of the instance identity property for each of the instances specifies a class name of a particular one of the classes that corresponds to the resource type of the resource represented by that instance, and, for each of the at least one property specified in the naming rule for the particular class, a name and value pair comprising the property and a corresponding value, for the resource represented by this instance, of that property (see Brunet, col. 7, ll. 35-36, "<naming attribute> <value> pair").

As to claims 19, 22 and 25, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches further comprising:

creating an identity for a particular one of the resources, using the naming rule for the class that corresponds to the resource type of the particular resource; and

storing the created identity as the value of the instance identity property for an instance which represents a particular resource (see section 2.2.1, "create the identifier for the resource").

As to claim 20, RDF Syntax teaches a system for uniquely identifying resources (see Abstract), comprising:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 23, RDF Syntax teaches a computer program product for uniquely identifying resources, the computer program product embodied on one or more computer-readable media and comprising computer readable program code (see Abstract) for:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 10 April 2009 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

Additional References

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to naming rules in general:

Doc. No.	Assigned to
US 7454743 B2	Fuchs; Daniel
US 7451156 B2	Ornstein; David et al.
US 7359902 B2	Ornstein; David et al.
US 7181441 B2	Mandato; Davide et al.
US 6983288 B1	Kirkwood; Michael J. et al.
US 5987440 A	O'Neil; Kevin et al.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner, Mark A. Radtke. The examiner's telephone number is (571) 272-7163, and the examiner can normally be reached between 9 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Neveen Abel-Jalil, can be reached at (571) 272-4074.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Customer Service at (800) 786-9199.

maxr
***

23 June 2009

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165